



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,897	12/26/2001	Vladimir S. Zaborovsky	FRACX 100	5179
7590	07/01/2005		EXAMINER	
Jason H. Foster Kremblas, Foster, Phillips & Pollick 7632 Slate Ridge Blvd. Reynoldsburg, OH 43068			FIELDS, COURTNEY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/036,897	ZABOROVSKY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Courtney D. Fields	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/26/2001</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement respectfully submitted on 26 December 2001 has been considered by the Examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because the drawings do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims and the unlabeled rectangular boxes shown in the drawings should be provided with descriptive text labels. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and

informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-7 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 appears to be a network device, however, the dependent claims are not written in the proper format. The preferred procedure for writing a claim would be as follows: The method of claim 1 further wherein... Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abraham (US Patent No. 5,983,270).

Regarding claim 1, Abraham discloses a local computer network for packets delivery with headers that contain logical and physical addresses of senders and/or receivers of information and a network screen that splits it to at least two segments and represents a complex of hardware and software means and contains at least two network interfaces for packets exchange between the network segments and a program that controls the process of packets commutation between the network interfaces based on the filtration rules that do not name logical addresses to the network interfaces and do not send their physical addresses to the next and at the same time permit a transit delivery through the network interfaces of the network screen only to the packets with the headers that passed the test in accordance to the defined filter rules and using a special direct interface to define these filter rules (See Column 6, lines 5-36, Column 7, lines 51-67, Column 8, lines 1-25, Column 9, lines 44-65, Column 11, lines 13-25, and Column 53, lines 24-48)

Regarding claim 2, Abraham discloses the claimed limitation wherein outbound packets keep in their headers physical addresses of the senders because the program that controls the network screen does not send outside local network physical addresses of its network interfaces (See Column 43, lines 38-67, Column 44, lines 1-67)

Regarding claim 3, Abraham discloses the claimed limitation wherein the network screen is based on a universal computer device with operational system and several

network interfaces and special direct interface where network interfaces are Ethernet adapters and special control interface may be based on Ethernet interface type or on the base of sequential asynchronous interface (See Column 2, lines 27-38)

Regarding claim 4, Abraham discloses the claimed limitation wherein filter rules of the network screen disallow a transit delivery of any messages without special mark and address parameters in their headers (See Column 46, lines 6-31, Column 51, lines 20-65)

Regarding claim 5, Abraham discloses the claimed limitation wherein the access to the program of editing filter rules is protected by password (See Column 43, lines 59-67, Column 44, lines 1-5, Column 46, lines 1-5)

Regarding claim 6, Abraham discloses the claimed limitation wherein the network screen after processing the packet with filter rules keeps unchanged logical and physical addresses of the sender in the packet's header and it does not name network interfaces with logical addresses and does not send their physical addresses to the network segments connected with them while the network screen contains special direct interface to edit and tune filter rules where any changes of filter parameters may be processed only through this interface and the program of control provides packet delivery from one network interface to another only when the information in the packet's header satisfies all filter requirements ((See Column 6, lines 5-36, Column 7, lines 51-67, Column 8, lines 1-25, Column 9, lines 44-65, Column 11, lines 13-25, and Column 53, lines 24-48)

Regarding claim 7, Abraham discloses the claimed limitation wherein the network screen is a special computer device with interface operational system universal bus for data exchange between the interface adapters and a separate channel of control protected by password (See Column 12, lines 15-45)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDJ
cdf
June 26, 2005

Matthew D. Smithers
MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137